



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Though no other example of disagreement occurs in the case of an adjective, petty errors of gender in the use of articles are found as well as errors in pronunciation and other evidences of imperfect acquaintance with Castilian Spanish. With no other example more significant than this before us, our conclusion on the point is reasonably safe. Lope wrote consistently *mucha agua, poca agua, mucha hambre*. If he did not go so far as to say *mucho hambre*, it is correct to infer that no expression<sup>33</sup> of this kind is to be found in any reputable author of the time.

H. M. MARTIN.

University of Illinois.

## A FORGOTTEN LOVELACE MANUSCRIPT

Few seventeenth century lyrics are better known or more admired than Lovelace's *To Lucasta: On Going to the Wars* and *To Althea: From Prison*. On these two poems Lovelace's reputation rests. By snipping away undesirable stanzas, makers of anthologies have produced two or three other passable poems, but after all, no one cares much about *The Rose, The Grasshopper*, or *To Amarantha: That She Would Dishevel Her Hair*, even in their altered form. The extraordinary excellence of the poems *To Lucasta* and *To Althea* gives a special significance to any question involving the text of either one of them.

When Professor Schelling published his edition of seventeenth century lyrics in 1899, he printed lines 7 and 8 of *To Althea* as follows:

The gods that wanton in the air  
Know no such liberty;

adding in the notes: "Gods. The original reading. There is no authority for *birds*, the usual reading."<sup>1</sup> Others have followed him in printing *gods* instead of *birds*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>33</sup> *Mucho hambre* is current among Chileans and perhaps the inhabitants of other South American countries. Cuervo, *l. c.*, par. 203; Menéndez Pidal, *l. c.*, par. 127; Roman, *Diccionario de Chilenismos*, Santiago de Chile, 1913, under *hambre*.

<sup>1</sup> F. E. Schelling, *A Book of Seventeenth Century Lyrics*, p. 267.

<sup>2</sup> W. C. Bronson, *English Poems* (The Elizabethan Age and the Purita

Schelling, to be sure, had, for the restoration of *gods* to the text, the authority of the first edition of *Lucasta*, which Wood says Lovelace himself prepared for the press. It is, however, to be questioned whether Schelling sufficiently considered the arguments that might be advanced for emendation. To begin with, *birds* pretty obviously makes the more sensible reading. Indeed it can hardly be doubted that Lovelace had birds rather than the Greek and Roman divinities in mind. Professor Grierson offers, in my opinion, the only possible defense of the text when he says: "The 'Gods' probably are the birds. Compare Aristophanes, *The Birds*, ll. 685-723, translated by Swinburne, *Studies in Song*." Yet it scarcely seems as though even so careless an artist as Lovelace would have wantonly destroyed the manifest parallelism between *fishes* and *winds* below by choosing to write *gods* instead of *birds*. And certainly the climax

Angels alone, that soar above,  
enjoy such liberty

is seriously weakened by the previous mention of gods.

Another argument for emendation was brought forward by Hazlitt as long ago as 1864 in his edition of Lovelace.<sup>3</sup> Hazlitt called attention to a manuscript of the poem in the possession of Philip Bliss. This manuscript, which appears to be contemporary with Lovelace, was printed by Bliss in his edition of Wood's *Athenae Oxonienses*.<sup>4</sup> Here the reading is *birds* instead of *gods*. Hazlitt felt that this manuscript evidence, coupled with many gross typographical errors in the original text, justified his printing *birds*. But Bliss himself had been somewhat doubtful, and others have apparently not been convinced.

There is, however, another hitherto unnoticed piece of evidence, which makes the case still clearer for the emended reading. In 1802 there appeared in the *British Critic*<sup>5</sup> an anonymous review of Ellis's *Specimens of Early English Poets*. In a foot-note the

Period), p. 296; F. B. Snyder and R. G. Martin, *A Book of English Literature*, p. 116; H. J. C. Grierson, *Metaphysical Lyrics & Poems of the Seventeenth Century*, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> W. C. Hazlitt, *Lucasta*, p. 118.

<sup>4</sup> London, 1813-20; 3. 461. The Bliss MS. is now in the British Museum (Add. MS. 22603, f. 16).

<sup>5</sup> 19. 621.

author gave variant readings from still another manuscript of *To Althea: From Prison*, a British Museum manuscript in the Harleian collection, No. 2127. I have nowhere else seen any allusion to it. It differs in many respects from both the Bliss version and the printed version, but here again we have the reading *birds*. As in the case of the other, this manuscript is apparently contemporary with Lovelace.<sup>6</sup> Thus we have two manuscripts both of which support an obviously desirable emendation. Even the most cautious textual critic, it seems, should be reassured by this second manuscript.

Though the primary interest of this forgotten manuscript doubtless lies in its support of an important emendation, there is an intrinsic interest attaching to any additional version of so famous a poem. Since it has apparently never been printed or even correctly collated, a somewhat careful examination of it, and a comparison of its readings with those of the other two versions, may be worth while. It is without title. Twenty-one of its 32 lines show verbal variations from the printed version, as against 12 lines in the Bliss manuscript; and the two manuscripts agree in their departures from the printed version in four lines only. The following are a few of its more interesting differences from the printed version. Flowing cups run "sweetly" instead of "swiftly" round. For "When healths and draughts go free," we have "And healths in bowls run free." Instead of "When, like committed linnets, I" we have "When, linnets-like committed, we." For "Minds innocent and quiet take" we have "A spotless mind and innocent." Finally a rather important difference lies in the use of the first person plural instead of the singular throughout the third and fourth stanzas.

But instead of quoting further variations, I shall give the Harleian version in full, modernized in respect to punctuation and spelling for the sake of more convenient comparison with the familiar version.

When Love with unconfined wings  
Hovers about my gates,

---

<sup>6</sup> The manuscript experts at the British Museum are of the opinion that "both copies are in all probability earlier than 1649, the date of the publication of *Lucasta*, and later than 1642, the alleged date of the composition of the poem."

And my divine Althea sings  
And whispers at my grates;  
When I lie tangled in her hair  
And fettered in her eye,  
The birds that wanton in the air  
Know no such liberty.

When flowing cups run sweetly round,  
(With no allaying Thames,  
Our careless heads with roses crowned,  
Our loyal hearts with flames;  
Whilst thirsty grief in wine we steep,  
And healths in bowls run free;  
Fishes that tippie in the deep  
Know no such liberty.

When, linnets-like committed, we  
With shriller notes do sing  
The glory, might, and majesty  
And goodness of our king;  
When we shall vote aloud how good  
He is, how great should be,  
Enlarged winds that curls the flood  
Know no such liberty.

Stone walls can not a prison make,  
Nor iron bars a cage:  
A spotless mind and innocent  
Calls that an hermitage.  
Whilst we have freedom in our love  
And in our souls are free,  
Angels alone that soar above  
Enjoy such liberty.

A detailed comparison of the variations justifies a few general observations. First, the number and nicety of the differences suggest the work of the poet himself in experimentation, revision, and polishing. We can hardly avoid the conclusion that the slovenly Lovelace for once applied the Jonsonian file. The great majority of his poems show only too clearly how hastily and carelessly he tossed them off, but here there seems to have been much weighing and testing. The version he finally printed is pretty clearly the best, but it is not much better than the others. Evidently Lovelace in this case carried revision beyond the point where many conscientious poets would have stopped. Wood tells us that it was during his imprisonment for presenting the Kentish petition

that "he made that celebrated song, *Stone walls do not a prison make.*" Perhaps his seven weeks of confinement in the Gate House at Westminster gave him not only the theme of his poem, but the enforced leisure to revise it, in which case the miracle of its perfection would be made the least bit more intelligible.

The value, then, for us, of this manuscript, apparently overlooked for a hundred and twenty years, lies, first, in the additional support it gives for an emendation which on æsthetic and logical grounds seems highly desirable; secondly, in its hint that what Jonson would call art (as opposed to nature) may have had a larger part than we have suspected in making *To Althea: From Prison* Lovelace's masterpiece.

A. C. JUDSON.

*The University of Texas.*

---

### SHELLEY'S DEBT TO ALMA MURRAY

The most ambitious and spectacular activity of the Shelley Society was the performance of *The Cenci* at the Grand Theatre, Islington, on May 7, 1886.<sup>1</sup> On that date Alma Murray (Mrs. Alfred Forman) established her reputation as the leading actress of English literary drama. Back of this performance lies the unacknowledged debt of Shelley's literary reputation to a woman, whose contribution is probably inferior only to that of Mary Shelley and Lady Shelley. Undoubtedly the usefulness of the Shelley Society to its idol was to some extent made possible, and was certainly very greatly increased, by the activities of this actress, whose lifelong ambition had been to create the part of Beatrice in a stage production of *The Cenci*. One cannot justly understand the development of Shelley's reputation without appreciating Alma Murray's share in it.

In 1884, before the formation of the Shelley Society, Miss Murray had already attracted attention as a charming and intelligent actress of literary drama. Her successful acting in that year of Constance in Browning's *In a Balcony* was the subject of a paper,

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Forman informs me that the date was chosen as a compliment to Robert Browning, who was born on May 7.